R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 302 24

COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS OF TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN.

BY- CARTER, LANORE J. AND OTHERS
GRAMBLING COLL., LA.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-1704 PUB DATE 63
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$3.84 96P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH, ENGLISH CURRICULUM, REMEDIAL PROGRAMS, *REMEDIAL COURSES, *COLLEGE INSTRUCTION, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS, TEACHING METHODS, LABORATORY EXPERIMENTS, LANGUAGE LABORATORIES, *COMPOSITION (LITERARY), *ORAL ENGLISH, GRAMBLING, LOUISIANA

REMEDIAL ENGLISH INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS FOR COLLEGE WERE COMPARED TO DETERMINE WHICH OF TWO APPROACHES PRODUCES THE GREATER AMOUNT OF MEASURABLE EDUCATIONAL RESULTS AND WHICH CONTRIBUTES TO GREATER PERSISTENCY OF ACQUIRED SKILLS IN WRITTEN AND SPOKEN ENGLISH. IN ADDITION, THE RELATIONSHIPS AMONG IMPROVEMENT AND PERSISTENCY OF IMPROVEMENT IN WRITTEN AND SPOKEN ENGLISH AND INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES WERE DESCRIBED. THE TWO INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES UNDER INVESTIGATION WERE--(1) THE CONVENTIONAL METHOD, INVOLVING THE USE OF A TEXTBOOK WITH LECTURES, GRAMMAR DRILLS, CLASS DISCUSSIONS, AND IMPROMPTU SPEECHES AND ESSAYS, CENTERED AROUND THE MOST COMMON ENGLISH ERRORS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS, AND (2) THE LABORATORY METHOD, USING SPECIALLY STRUCTURED, UNREHEARSED VERBAL RECORDINGS OF CLASSROOM RESPONSES AND MIMEOGRAPHED COPIES OF THE SAME MATERIAL AS TEACHING CONTENT TO INSTILL BETTER STUDENT UNDERSTANDING AND SKILLS IN ENGLISH WITHOUT THE USE OF TEXTBOOKS OR WORKBOOKS. APPROXIMATELY 130 COLLEGE FRESHMEN ENROLLED IN 4 CLASSES (2 FOR EACH METHOD) WERE THE SUBJECTS. PRETEST, RETEST, AND PERSISTENCY TEST SCORES WERE OBTAINED AND ANALYZED ON THE STUDENTS' WRITTEN OR SPOKEN ENGLISH. USING THIS SAMPLE, THE INVESTIGATORS NOTED THAT THE LABORATORY METHOD WAS ONLY SUPERIOR WITH RESPECT TO TEACHING SPOKEN ENGLISH SKILLS. OTHER DEMONSTRATED DIFFERENCES WERE NEGLIGIBLE. FURTHER RESEARCH WAS SUGGESTED, HOWEVER, TO DETERMINE THE PRODUCTIVITY OF THIS LABORATORY METHOD IN REGULAR ENGLISH CLASSES. (JH)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

COMPARISON OF TWO METHODS OF TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH TO COLLEGE FRESHMEN

Cooperative Research Project #1704

Principal Investigators:

Lamore J. Carter
Bessie E. Dickerson
Tilden LeMelle

Grambling College

Grambling, Louisiana

1963

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

ED 003302

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their very conscientious effort in completing task responsibilities so crucial to this study, we are very much indebted to the following persons:

Mr. Clarence C. Miller, teacher of two of the remedial English classes.

Mrs. Annie J. Simmons, teacher of two of the remedial English classes.

Dr. Arlynne L. Cheers, design consultant and statistician.

Mrs. Carolyn Y. McCree, language consultant.

Mrs. Hazel T Earles, project secretary and typist of voluminous materials related to the project during its operation.

We are also especially grateful for the excellent cooperation shown by the administrators of Grambling College and for the diligent participation of the students involved in the project.

L. J. C.
B. E. D.
T. L.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Acknowledgements		i
Table of Contents		ii
List of Tables		iv
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Statement of Objectives	2
II.	RELATED RESEARCH	4
III.	PROCEDURE	9
	Population and Design	9
	Methods	9
	Data	11
	Analyses	13
IV.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	17
	Statement of Hypothesis I	17
	Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis I	17
	Statement of Hypothesis II	25
	Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis II	25
	Statement of Hypothesis III	29
	Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis III	33
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	44
Bibliography		46

	Page
Appendix A	48
Appendix B	53
Appendix C	70
Appendix D	80

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Summary of Experimental Data for Sample of Freshman College Students	18
2	Sums of Squares and Cross Products in Deviation Form for Subgroups	20
3	Test of Significance of Method On Improvement (Hypothesis IA)	20
4	Results of Pretest of Samples of Freshman College Students on the Spoken English Scale	21
5	Testing the A Priori Hypothesis Regarding Students Taught by Method A (N = 57)	23
6	Testing the A Priori Hypothesis Regarding Students Taught by Method B (N = 136)	24
7	Summary of Experimental Data for Sample of Freshman College Students	27
8	Sums of Squares and Cross Products in Deviation Form for Subgroups	28
9	Test of Significance of Method on Improvement	28
10	Results of Re-Test of Sample of Freshman College Students on the Spoken English Scale	30
11	Testing the A Priori Hypothesis Regarding Students Taught by Method A (N = 53)	31
12	Testing the A priori Hypothesis Regarding Students Taught by Method B (N = 80)	32
13	Sums and Means of Test Scores for the Four Sub-Groups of Cooperative English Test	34

Table		Page
14	Summary of Experimental Data for Freshmen College Students Taught by Two Methods	35
15	Deviation Form Sums of Squares and Cross Products for all Sources of Variation	36
16	Deviation Form Sums of Squares and Cross Products for Sources of Variation Combined With Within	37
17	Tests of Significance of the Variation	38
18	Significance of Differences in Measured Gain of Subgroup of Freshman Students Taught by Different Approaches of Method A	39
19	Record of Errors Made (Scores) on the "Spoken English Scale"	69

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Certainly one of the major problems confronting many state-supported colleges is one relating to the need for remedial English work to improve the language skills of a large percentage of the entering freshmen (5). Without remedial English, the majority of these students fail and/or drop out of college (12). When remedial English is offered, a sizable segment of the teaching staff is involved in sub-college teaching. This is a dilemma that has led to the abandonment of remedial English in several colleges and thoughts of course re-organization in most (5). Implications from research in the teaching of English and in other pertinent areas have led to the authors' belief that the solution to the dilemma may be in a modified laboratory-type method of teaching that (1) could accommodate very large classes with no increase in the number of teachers and (2) could be done with very small cost.

The problem was that of determining the relative effectiveness (improvement and persistency of improvement) in written and spoken English of two methods of teaching remedial English to two selected

groups of freshmen students at Grambling (State) College, Grambling, Louisiana. The two methods are briefly described under Methods in Chapter III.

Statement of Objectives

This investigation was designed to afford data bearing on the following major questions and hypotheses regarding methods of instruction in remedial English at the college level:

1. Which of two methods of remedial English instruction produces the greater amount of measurable educational results (improvement in written and spoken English)?

   Hypothesis I. There is no difference in the improvement in written and spoken English of freshmen college students (N • approximately 120) irrespective of which of two methods of teaching is used.

2. What method contributes to the greatest persistency of acquired skills in written and spoken English?

   Hypothesis II. There is no difference between the two methods of teaching remedial English in terms of persistency of any improvement in written and spoken English derived therefrom.

3. What are the relationships among improvement in written and spoken English, intelligence test scores and persistency of improvement in written and spoken English?

   Hypothesis III. There is no difference in results (improvement in written and spoken English and/or persistency of results) of two methods of teaching remedial English to freshmen whether students rank in the upper or lower 30 per cent of the study populations in terms of group intelligence test scores.

An added question related to the effects of utilizing a minimum amount of electronic equipment in one of the Control Group Classes.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

Regular English classes and remedial English classes in most of our schools and colleges are still taught by use of traditional methods (verbal and written grammar drills, impromptu speeches and theme writing, etc.) supplemented by a book written for college students. The traditional methods persist in spite of a preponderance of evidence pointing up the general superiority of newer methods which employ laboratory-type activities (1, 4, 13, 15, 21). Best guesses in explanation of the persistency of traditional methods would probably make mention of such factors as (1) general professional inertia, (2) lack of belief in, or implications of, results of research findings, (3) feelings of lack of training needed to make the method effective, (4) doubt concerning comparative cost and teacher labor involved in the two methods, and, (5) lack of administrative approval to try laboratory-type methods.

At Grambling College where the freshman class numbers approximately 850, the freshman English Program is a workable and potentially successful program on paper. In practice, the program is about 50% effective primarily because of an inadequate Remedial English Program.

The college remedial program is designed to bridge the gap between pre-college English and college freshman English. At Grambling College over 80% of new freshmen score below the minimal requirements for acceptance into the Freshman English Program. Because of departmental policy, however, less than 50% of these freshmen are placed into remedial English. The discrepancy is evident from an interpretation of the following representative figures.

Of 85 new freshmen taking the California Language Test in the summer of 1960, only 7 scored 13.00 and above. Thirty-five scored less than 9.00. That is, less than 9% qualified to do college freshman English. Almost 42% scored below high school level. Over 50% of the 85 were placed into freshman English.

The problems of the Freshman English Program become evident. To meet the needs of the students, the Freshman English Program, of necessity, is merely a heightened remedial program. Because of this necessary lowering of standards, the entire English Program falls short of its objectives.

Therefore, basic to the success of the entire English Program is the Remedial Program. This program must be intensified and made effective particularly since about 90% of new freshmen are in dire need of remediation.

Experimental evidence pointing up the advantages of a laboratory-type program in English appeared in advance of experiments with the

program. Seegers (19) noted in 1923 that pupils improved most rapidly in language usage when informed of their own individual deficiencies. Similarly, Shepherd (20) found evidence in 1925 in accord with his contention that pupils improve most when they study according to their own needs.

The 1950 Edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research (9) points up what was then the need for future research related to the teaching of English. Among the prominent areas mentioned which still needed additional research were the areas including preparation and evaluation of efficient remedial and maintenance materials.

Eckert (10), in the 1960 Edition of the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, concludes that the laboratory activities that stress individual and small group problem-solving may yield more profitable results. She further states that language laboratories, in which students use pre-recorded materials for self-instruction, are relatively new, but that initial appraisals seem to justify much wider use of them.

The traditional method of teaching English and such modifications as those calling for varying amounts of impromptu speeches and writings, lectures and out-of-class assignments have been found to elicit measurable improvement in language usage as revealed by written tests (6, 23). However, investigators (2, 3, 8, 11, 22) have noted substantial measurable differences between what students learned (as shown by written test) from English courses and what they were found to be using in oral

expression. This seems to implicate the degree of and/or persistency of learning in English courses. That is, the greater the learning in English courses, the easier should be the facilitation of transfer to oral expression. It seems easily conceivable that a laboratory-type method might contribute more to this facilitation of transfer.

In spite of all the experimental evidence favoring the laboratory method, it is rarely ever seen in pure form in many parts of the country and generally avoided at the college level (1). As indicated earlier, among the theorized reasons for this sparsity of laboratory-type English work are the matters of professional inertia and concern about cost. There seems to be a need for an investigation which will add specificity to already established generalization regarding the relative productivity of the two methods and, at the same time, afford evidence on the simplicity and economy of the laboratory method. In addition, it should prove useful to determine the apparent relationship between the productivity of the two methods and such variables as intelligence, weaknesses in language usage and sex.

To the authors' knowledge, there is no record of research relating either to the persistency of language skills learned under such conditions as studied herein, or to the relative effectiveness of methods as a function of ability level, as was planned herein. It is conceivable that any superiority of a laboratory-type method may be over-shadowed by a greater persistency of skill learned via the traditional method of

teaching remedial English, and/or that major differences in the effectiveness of the methods are attributable to levels of intelligence of pupils. This study provided data relevant to these possibilities.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Population and Design

The initial study population was composed of approximately 140 freshmen students enrolled at Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana, who had been assigned to remedial English as a result of having scored below the local thirtieth percentile on Form 1A of the Cooperative English Test. The experimental design was the test-retest method, in which the students were divided into a Control Group and an Experimental Group matched in terms of such criteria as intelligence, years of college experience, sex and scores on the Cooperative English Test. The Experimental Group began with two classes of approximately 40 pupils; the Control Group began with two classes of approximately 25 students. All four classes loss some students because of drop out, illnesses and other unavoidable factors during the experimental phase of the study.

Methods

The Control Group was taught by Method A; the Experimental Group by Method B. Each of two similarly experienced and well qualified teachers taught one section of the Control Group and one section of the

Experimental Group for one-half semester. At the half-semester, the two teachers exchanged classes and completed the semester of teaching the other two groups (four classes). The differences between the two groups was as defined in the following description of the two methods of teaching:

(1) Method A - Traditional (or Conventional) Method, classes in which the teacher attempted to teach the students better understandings and skills in written and spoken English by use of such activities as lectures, grammar drills, class discussions, and impromptu speeches and essays centered around the most common errors of college students. A textbook was used by both classes of the Control Group; however, one class utilized a tape recorder for six days and the other did not.

(2) Method B - Experimental (or Laboratory) Method, remedial English classes in which the teacher attempted to instill in the students better understandings and skills in written and spoken English by using especially structured, unrehearsed, verbal recordings of responses of class participants and mimeographed copies of the same material as the content for teaching. Thus, students were constantly involved in a study of each others' language deficiencies. No textbook or workbook was used.

Methods A and B had points of similarity in that the teachers of Method B had occasions to use some of the activities listed under Method

A above, but only as the need arose in conjunction with the class work during listening and discussion sessions employing recording of students in class or in conjunction with class work which utilized mimeographed copies of recordings. That is to say, the teachers of the Experimental Group (Method B) could render brief statements which pointed up errors in sentence structure heard in a recording; they could drill the class over incorrect pronunciation heard; ask for discussion relative to verb usage seen on copies of recorded verbal material; request an overnight assignment calling for the correction of mimeographed copies of verbal recordings of class members. In all instances, the student was brought in contact with his own work or that of a member of the class. The teachers of both methods gave the same amount of time and effort to individual conferences with students.

The incentive for students in both groups was approximately the same inasmuch as final grades in remedial English were understood to be a determining factor in the student's further progress toward graduation, etc.

Data

Computational data utilized in this investigation were pretest, re-test and persistency test scores made on the Cooperative English Test and similar scores made on a personally constructed "Spoken English Scale" used for analyzing the "structured" tape recordings of

the students in both groups. Raw score data from the two tests appear in Appendix A and B.

The personally constructed scale mentioned above consisted of an especially selected series of passages (folk sayings and proverbs) to be recast by each individual student and requiring that the student respond verbally in such a manner as to make obvious his inadequacies in spoken English usage. More specifically this objectified manner of scaling spoken English usage was achieved by the following steps:

(1) Each student was required to visit the recording laboratory for an 8 to 12 minute warm-up exercise and a recorded interview with an English teacher who had been selected as response prompter.

(2) The response prompter gave each student a standard explanation of the general purpose of the recording session and then required that each student recast verbally a series of passages which provided for demonstration of a wide range of ability in English grammar. The passages were especially selected so as to permit a scaling of verbal errors that might be classified as diction, grammar and sentence structure. The instrument was called a "Spoken English Scale," is described in Appendix C, and is illustrated by the following example:

(Example - The prompter hands the student two written passages selected from a list of well-known short folk sayings and proverbs; reads each one aloud as the student reads from his copy and make the following verbal requests of the student:

(1) Say in your own words what each passage says.

(2) Illustrate the meaning of each passage by use of an example involving yourself and others.

(3) Tell me of your belief in the truthfulness of the two passages and why you do or do not believe them.

(3) Provisions were made for tape recording and later analysis of each student's attempt to properly recast the passages.

(4) The same three steps were utilized for pretest, re-test and persistency test phases of the investigation.

One phase of the investigation involved studying the effectiveness of the two methods as a function of student ability level. This was facilitated by comparing pretest and re-test scores of freshmen who represented approximately the upper and lower thirty per cent of students in the Experimental and Control Groups in terms of scores on the School and College Ability Test, Form ID.

Analyses

Statistical computations involved analysis of co-variance for the written data and Chi-square for the data provided by the "Spoken English Scale." Use of analysis of co-variance provided for an adjustment in final scores which allowed for unavoidable initial differences in intelligence.

Chi-square was chosen as the statistic for use with spoken English data when it was discovered that the incidence of drop-outs before final (persistency) test had severely reduced the study population.

The general plan of the investigation can be summarized as follows:

Step I. Acquired from the Grambling College Testing Center a list of all students assigned to remedial English for the Fall Semester, 1962-63, as a result of having scored below the 30th percentile (local norms) of the Cooperative English Test, Form 1A. Utilized a table of numbers to facilitate the random selection of approximately 140 freshmen from this list.

Step II. Administered the following tests to the students selected in Step I above:

A. A "Spoken English Scale" constructed by the investigators and having the qualities of objective scoring of spoken English in terms of sentence structure, grammar and diction. (In order to facilitate objective scoring and pretest, re-test and persistency test comparison of spoken English, a tape recording was made of each freshman's performance in attempting to recast an especially selected series of passages

which we called our "Spoken English Scale.")

B. The School and College Ability Test, Form ID.

Step III. Matched four groups (two groups of approximately 40 each; two groups of approximately 25 each) of students in terms of total score on the Cooperative English Test, Form IA, years of college experience and sex.

Step IV. Designated two classes as the Control Group and the other two classes as the Experimental Group. Had each Control Class include approximately 25 students and each Experimental Class include approximately 40 students. Assigned the Control Group to Method A of instruction and the Experimental Group to Method B. Applied the two methods for a period of one semester utilizing two well qualified and experienced teachers. Had the teacher exchange classes at half semester.

Step V. Terminated the experiment after one semester by administering Form 1B of the Cooperative English Test and an alternate form of the "Spoken English Scale."

Step VI. Administered a third form of Cooperative English Test and re-administered the "Spoken English Scale" approximately 30 days following the re-test which was given at the termination of the Control and Experimental Groups.

Step VII. Analyzed all data from Cooperative English Test scores by analysis of co-variance and include computation of the relationship of ability level (intelligence) to the effectiveness of the methods. Analyzed data from "Spoken English Scale" by use of Chi-square.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of analysis of data are presented here in the order of previously listed questions and hypotheses.

Statement of Hypothesis I

There is no difference in the improvement in the written and spoken English of this sample of freshmen college students irrespective of which of the two methods is used.

Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis I

As a criterion for improvement in written English, scores made on the Cooperative English Test, Form 1B, were used. Since the scholastic aptitude and prior achievement in written English could conceivably influence each student's response to the criterion, these individual differences were controlled by obtaining the School and College Ability Test, Form 1D, scores as a measure of scholastic aptitude and pretest scores on the criterion as a measure of prior achievement in written English for each student in the sample. Table 1 shows the data that were used in the analysis of co-variance.

The values in Table 1 were used to compute the sums of squares

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR SAMPLE OF FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Hypothesis IA)

Variable	Symbol	Method A (N_A = 53)	Method B (N_B = 69)	Total (N = 122)
Posttest scores	ΣY_1	1399	1954	3353
Pretest scores	ΣX_1	882	1220	2102
SCAT scores	ΣX_2	3456	4589	8045
Means	$\overline{Y}_1$	26.40	28.32	27.48
	$\overline{X}_1$	16.64	17.68	17.22
	$\overline{X}_2$	265.20*	266.51*	265.94*
Squares	ΣY_1^2			106219
	ΣX_1^2			41790
	ΣX_2^2			541943
Cross products	$\Sigma X_1 Y_1$			60637
	$\Sigma X_1 X_2$			142585
	$\Sigma Y_1 X_2$			224331

*SCAT scores were coded by subtracting 200

and the sums of crossproducts in deviation form for the total sample and for within the subgroups. These values are presented in Table 2.

Table 3 shows the test of significance of the null hypothesis that the freshmen college students of this sample do not differ in improvement in written English irrespective of the method used. Since the F - value of 0.4597 with 1 and 118 degrees of freedom does not approach significance at the 5 per cent level of confidence there is no reason to adjust the criterion means for comparison.

In spite of the observed arithmetic difference in the criterion means of the subgroups, the null hypothesis is upheld.

As a criterion for improvement in spoken English, scores made on a Spoken English Scale and recorded by electronic equipment were used. The errors made on the test were classified according to types as follows: Grammar (G), Diction (D), and Sentence Structure (S).

Table 4 presents the results from the pretest.

On the basis of the errors made on the pretest, the investigators hypothesized, first, that the students to be taught by Method A could be expected to err in spoken English according to the following ratios: Students and errors in grammar--1:2.79; students and errors in diction--1:2.78; students and errors in sentence structure--1:0.79. Secondly, that the students to be taught by Method B could be expected to err in spoken English according to the following ratios: Students and errors in Grammar--1:3.05; students and errors in Diction--1:2.18; and

TABLE 2

SUMS OF SQUARES AND CROSS PRODUCTS IN DEVIATION FORM FOR SUBGROUPS
(Hypothesis IA)

Source of Variation	ξy_1^2	ξx_1^2	ξx_2^2	$\xi x_1 y_1$	$\xi x_1 x_2$	$\xi x_2 y_1$
Total within	14066.47	5573.57	11434.59	2866.46	3973.61	3225.39
Subgroups	13955.67	5541.18	11383.97	2806.54	3933.10	3150.48

TABLE 3

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF METHOD ON IMPROVEMENT (Hypothesis IA)

Source of Variation	Residuals		
	Degrees of Freedom	Sums of Squares	Mean Square
Total within	119	13430.1070	
Subgroups	118	13377.9881	113.3727
Difference	1	52.1189	52.1189

$$F_{1.118} = \frac{52.1189}{113.3727} = 0.4597$$

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF PRETEST OF SAMPLE OF FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS ON THE SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE

(Hypothesis IB)

	Frequency of Errors in Grammar	Frequency of Errors in Diction	Frequency of Errors in Sentence Structure	Totals
Method A				
N = 57	159	156	44	359
Method B				
N = 136	415	296	134	845

students and errors in Sentence Structure--1:1. The question then to be answered was: Do the results on the re-tests represent a departure from the expected frequencies too great to be attributed to chance?

Chi-square was used to answer this question, and this analysis is presented in Tables 5 and 6.

For the students taught by Method A the computed value of Chi-square, 8.0604, exceeds the 2 per cent point, 7.824, for 2 degrees of freedom. Hence, if the sample were drawn from a population in which the ratio of students to error was as observed (1:2.79; 1:2.78; and 1:0.79), something has happened to the sample that would occur on the basis of chance less than 2 per cent of the time. It thus appears that the results of the re-test of students taught by Method A represents a departure from the expected frequencies that could be attributed to chance only twice in each one hundred occurrences.

At this point, the direction of the change that has occurred demands attention. Inspection shows that the value that contributes significantly to the size of Chi-square results from a much greater than expected number of errors in Sentence Structure. In this instance the outcome is diametrically opposed to the change sought by the investigators. The obvious conclusion is that students taught by Method A showed, at the time of re-test, a difference that reflects a change in the direction of more errors in Sentence Structure, and this difference could be explained

TABLE 5

TESTING THE A PRIORI HYPOTHESIS REGARDING STUDENTS TAUGHT BY METHOD A (N = 57)

(Hypothesis IB)

	Errors in Grammar	Errors in Diction	Errors in Sentence Structure
Observed	143	144	60
Expected	147.87	147.34	41.87
(o - e)	-4.87	-3.34	18.13
$(o - e)^2$	23.7169	11.1556	327.61
$\frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$	0.1603	0.0757	7.8244

Chi-Square = 8.0604

TABLE 6

TESTING THE A PRIORI HYPOTHESIS REGARDING STUDENTS TAUGHT BY METHOD B (N = 136)

(Hypothesis IB)

	Errors in Grammar	Errors in Diction	Errors in Sentence Structure
Observed	233	119	73
Expected	244	174.4	80
(o - e)	-11.00	-55.4	-7
$(o - e)^2$	121	3069.16	49
$\frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$	0.4959	17.5983	0.6125

Chi-Square = 18.70

by chance only two times in one hundred, if the original a priori hypothesis is accepted.

For the students taught by Method B, the computed value of Chi-square, 18.70, exceeds the 1 per cent point. Since this sample appears to have changed to an extent that would happen by chance less than one time in a hundred, the question of difference in the re-test results may be answered in the affirmative, and the original hypothesis of no difference in improvement in spoken English irrespective of method is there upon rejected since superiority of Method B is inferred.

Statement of Hypothesis II

In consideration of the fact that during the period of time allowed to determine "persistence" the sample received additional instruction in English, Hypothesis II was restated as follows:

There is no difference in the immediate subsequent improvement in written and spoken English of freshman college students irrespective of which of two methods is used.

Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis II

As a criterion for improvement in written English, scores made on the Cooperative English Test, Form 2B were used. Inasmuch as the question here is one of difference in later achievement that can be attributed to a method of teaching, the influence of prior achievement and

scholastic aptitude has been controlled.

Table 7 shows the data used in the analysis of co-variance, with re-test scores, referred to in Hypothesis 1A, used as a measure of achievement in English, and SCAT scores, as a measure of scholastic aptitude, being used as controls.

Table 8 reports the sums of squares and the sums of cross-products, and Table 9 reports the test of significance.

Since the F - value of 3.753 with 1 and 118 degrees of freedom is too small for significance at the 5 per cent level of confidence there is no reason to adjust the criterion means for comparison.

In spite of the arithmetic difference which seems to favor the experimental group, there is insufficient evidence that the null hypothesis is untenable.

Scores made on a third administration of the "Spoken English Scale" were used as a criterion for improvement in spoken English. The question to be answered was: Do the results on the third administration represent a greater-than-chance departure from expected frequencies?

Errors made on the re-test (second administration) of the "Spoken English Scale" were used as the basis for the following a priori hypothesis.

Students to be taught by Method A could be expected to err in spoken English according to the following ratios: Students and errors

TABLE 7

SUMMARY OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR SAMPLE OF FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Hypothesis IIA)

Variable	Symbol	Method A (N_A = 53)	Method B (N_B = 69)	Total (N = 122)
Third Test scores	ΣY_2	1616	2356	3972
Posttest scores	ΣY_1	1399	1954	3353
SCAT scores	ΣX_2	3456	4589	8945
Means	$\overline{Y}_2$	30.49	34.14	32.55
	$\overline{Y}_1$	26.40	28.32	27.48
	$\overline{X}_2$	265.20*	266.51*	265.94*
Squares	ΣY_2^2			142928
	ΣY_1^2			106219
	ΣX_2^2			541943
Cross products	$\Sigma Y_1 Y_2$			115445
	$\Sigma Y_1 X_2$			224331
	$\Sigma X_2 Y_2$			268387

*SCAT scores were coded by subtracting 200

TABLE 8

SUMS OF SQUARES AND CROSS PRODUCTS IN DEVIATION FORM FOR SUBGROUPS
(Hypothesis IIA)

Source of Variation	Σy_2^2	Σy_1^2	Σx_2^2	$\Sigma y_1 y_2$	$\Sigma y_1 x_2$	$\Sigma x_2 y_2$
Total within	13610.10	14066.47	11434.59	6280.00	3225.39	6462.90
Subgroups	13209.80	13955.67	11383.97	6069.52	3150.48	6320.53

TABLE 9

TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE OF METHOD ON IMPROVEMENT (Hypothesis IIA)

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares
Total within	119	8785.8143	
Subgroups	118	8515.0199	72.1612
Difference	1	52.1189	52.1189

$F_{1.118} = 3.753$

in grammar--1:2.70; students and errors in diction--1:2.72; and students and errors in sentence structure--1:1.11. Students to be taught by Method B could be expected to err according to the following ratios: Students and errors in grammar--1.2:91; students and errors in diction--1:2.74; and students and errors in sentence structure--1:0.91. These data are presented in Table 10.

Chi-square was used to test the results of the Methods. Tables 11 and 12 show this analysis.

The results of the analysis yield Chi-square values of 49.34 and 44.28 for Methods A and B, respectively. These values greatly exceed the value, 9.210, needed for significance at the 1 per cent level. It thus appears that students taught by both methods experienced changes that could be explained by chance less than once in one hundred occurrences. Since inspection shows the changes to have been in the desired direction, the hypothesis of "no difference in later achievement irrespective of method" is upheld.

Statement of Hypothesis III

For this sample of freshman college students, there is no difference in the results of the two methods of teaching remedial English whether students rank in the upper or lower 30 per cent of the student population in terms of group intelligence test scores.

TABLE 10

RESULTS OF RETEST OF SAMPLE OF FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS ON THE SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE

(Hypothesis IIB)

	Frequency of Errors in Grammar	Frequency of Errors in Diction	Frequency of Errors in Sentence Structure	Totals
Method A				
(N = 53)	143	144	60	347
Method B				
(N = 80)	233	219	73	525

TABLE 11

TESTING THE A PRIORI HYPOTHESIS REGARDING STUDENTS TAUGHT BY METHOD A (N = 53)

	Errors in Grammar	Errors in Diction	Errors in Sentence Structure
Observed	62	41	22
Expected	94.50	95.20	38.85
(o - e)	-32.5	-54.2	-16.85
$(o - e)^2$	1056.25	2937.64	283.92
$\frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$	11.18	30.85	7.37

Chi-Square = 49.34

TABLE 12

TESTING THE A PRIORI HYPOTHESIS REGARDING STUDENTS
TAUGHT BY METHOD B (N = 80)

	Errors in Grammar	Errors in Diction	Errors in Sentence Structure
Observed	137	92	58
Expected	180.42	167.14	55.51
(o - e)	-43.42	-75.14	2.49
$(o - e)^2$	1883.56	5640.01	6.20
$\frac{(o - e)^2}{e}$	10.43	33.74	0.1116

Chi-Square = 44.28

Discussion of Results Regarding Hypothesis III

Again, the criterion for improvement in written English was scores made on the Cooperative English Test, Form 1B. Individual differences were controlled by obtaining the School and College Ability Test, Form 1D, scores as a measure of scholastic aptitude and pretest scores on the criterion as a measure of prior achievement in written English. These scores were obtained for the upper and lower 30 per cent of the sample. Table 13 shows the data that were used in the analysis of co-variance.

Tables 14, 15, and 16 present the analysis.

Table 17 shows the tests of significance of the null hypothesis. Since the F values of 0.4328, 1.26, and 0.0692 with 1 and 56 degrees of freedom do not approach significance at the 5 per cent level of confidence there is no reason to adjust the criterion for comparison. The null hypothesis is again upheld.

A subgroup of thirty-one students chosen at random from the group taught by Method A was provided an experience (Method A_1) which presumably should have produced a shift in scores on the criterion variable. The remaining group of twenty-two students was exposed only to those experiences which were presumably alike for both groups. Table 18 shows the test of significance of the effect of the provided experience as measured by scores on the Cooperative English Test.

TABLE 13

SUMS AND MEANS OF TEST SCORES FOR THE FOUR SUBGROUPS OF COOPERATIVE ENGLISH TEST

	Number	Post test		Pretest	
	N	Y_1	$\overline{Y}$	Y_1	$\overline{Y}$
Group taught by Method A					
Upper	15	425	28.33	295	19.66
Lower	15	393	26.20	209	13.93
Subtotal	30	818	27.27	504	16.80
Group taught by Method B					
Upper	15	440	29.33	300	20.00
Lower	15	440	29.33	220	14.66
Subtotal	30	880	29.33	520	17.33
TOTAL	60	1698	28.30	1024	17.07

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF EXPERIMENTAL DATA FOR FRESHMAN COLLEGE STUDENTS TAUGHT BY TWO METHODS

Scores	Symbol	Total of both groups
Posttest scores	ΣY_1^2	55418
Pretest scores	Σx_1^2	21058
Cross product	ΣXY = 30577	

TABLE 15

DEVIATION FORM SUMS OF SQUARES AND CROSS PRODUCTS
FOR ALL SOURCES OF VARIATION

Source of Variation	Σy^2	Σx^2	$\Sigma x_1 y$	df
Total	7364.60	3581.7334	1597.8000	
Method	64.06	4.2667	16.5333	57
Scholastic Aptitude	128.26	459.2667	88.5333	57
Interaction	10.92	0.5998	3.2033	57
Within	7161.36	3117.6002	1509.2700	56

TABLE 16

DEVIATION FORM SUMS OF SQUARES AND CROSS PRODUCTS FOR SOURCES OF VARIATION COMBINED WITH WITHIN

	Σy^2	Σx^2	Σy	df	Residuals Sums of Squares
Method	7225.42	3121.8669	1525.8033	57	6480.404
Scholastic Aptitude	7289.62	3576.8669	1597.8033	57	6575.874
Interaction	7172.28	3118.2000	1512.4733	57	6438.659
Within alone	7161.36	3117.6002	1509.27000	56	6430.703

TABLE 17

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VARIATION

	Residuals		
	Sums	df	Mean Square
Method and Within	6480.404	57	
Within alone	6430.703	56	114.8339
Method	49.701	1	49.701

$$F_{1,56} = \frac{49.701}{114.8339} = 0.4328$$

Scholastic Aptitude and Within	6575.874	57	
Within alone	6430.703	56	114.8339
Scholastic Aptitude	145.171	1	145.171

$$F_{1,56} = \frac{145.171}{114.8339} = 1.26$$

Interaction and Within	6438.659	57	
Within alone	6430.703	56	114.8339
Interaction	7.956	1	7.956

$$F_{1,56} = \frac{7.956}{114.8339} = 0.0692$$

TABLE 18

SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES IN MEASURED GAIN OF SUBGROUP OF FRESHMAN STUDENTS TAUGHT BY DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF METHOD A.

$$\sigma_D = \sqrt{\frac{S^2}{N_A} + \frac{S^2}{N_{A_1}}}$$

Method A	Method A_1
N = 22	N = 31
(Pretest) M = 18.47	(Pretest) M = 15.93
(Re-test) M = 26.38	(Re-test) M = 27.25
D_A = 7.91	D_{A_1} = 11.32

D = 3.41	df = 51
S_{D_M} = 3.07	t = 1.11

Form 1B.

Since the concern of the investigation was the change that was due to the interpolated experience, the most meaningful difference in this instance is the net change between the groups, i.e., D_{A_1}-D_A. Inasmuch as the t test of significance is used, the underlying assumption is that the populations have the same variance. By computation, the best estimate of the common variance of these groups is 3.07. With the appropriate degrees of freedom, the t value of 1.11 approaches, but fails to reach the .05 level of significance. Thus the effect of the interpolated experience is not demonstrated by this sample. However, the fact that the t value does approach the .05 level of significance, raises the question of whether more research might make evident a combination of some of the experiences in the two methods that would be more effective than either method alone.

Certainly there is some uniqueness in the design, operation and educational setting of this study as compared to other related research. It is these properties which support the claim of having extended the field of knowledge about the productivity of laboratory methods in teaching English at the college level.

The groups were not perfectly or consistently matched in number throughout the experiment. This represented a deviation from initial plans which set the ratio of students in the Control Group (Method A)

and Experimental or Laboratory Group (Method B) at 50 and 60, respectively. According to the initial plans, the two classes of which the Control Group was composed would have had 25 students in each; the two classes of which the experimental class was composed would have had 40 students in each. It was not possible to follow this plan to the letter because of unavoidable changes in student schedules, early student drop-outs, illnesses and failures. It is assumed that changes in N did not seriously impair the experimental design, however, inasmuch as N for the Experimental Group (Method B) was consistently much higher than the Control Group (Method A).

Prophetic corroboration of findings of Seegers (19) and Sheppard (20) and conclusions of Eckart (10) came early. Numerous students, when confronted with taped segments of personal verbalizations made in classes, expressed adject amazement that they could have verbalized such incorrect sentences, phrases, or words as they heard themselves saying. This seems to re-emphasize two points, namely: (1) the importance of having students study their own errors and (2) the fruitfulness of having the students hear and recognize their errors as they are made by them.

As stated previously, students in the Control Group made a much greater than expected number of errors in sentence structure at the time of re-test with the "Spoken English Scale." This represented an outcome

which was diametrically opposed to the change sought by the investigators. This phenomenon is reasoned to have been the results of combined effects of (1) ineffective transfer of understandings and skills in written English to spoken English behavior and (2) significant increase in the amount of verbalizing by the members of the Control Group at the time of re-test. Records of the verbalizations of the Control Group show that the members of the group tried to use significantly more sentences at the time of re-test than they utilized at pretest time.

As would be expected, there was much enthusiasm shown for the experiment. This enthusiasm, generated by students and the teachers, was present in control and experimental groups as evidenced by un-solicited comments, industry in study and class participation by students, and remarks made by the two teachers during conferences regarding the study. Part of the enthusiasm was doubtlessly due to the newness of the approach to teaching remedial English. However, the greater amount of enthusiasm we attribute to the students' appreciation of certain psycho-logical advantages of the Laboratory Method. These may be described as relating to (1) the personal nature of the content and course experience and (2) the relative immediacy and personal nature of reward for effort, as compared to non-laboratory class experience and content.

Teachers who have taught former members of the Experimental Group (Method B) describe them as "more verbal and definitely more

conscious of proper usage and structure." This we interpret as a salute to good productivity of the laboratory-type method of teaching remedial English.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of analysis of data affords several specific conclusions and implications related to the problem studied in this investigation. The major conclusions are as follows:

(1) The Traditional Method (Method A) and the Laboratory or Experimental Method (Method B) as described herein are equally productive as means of teaching written English skills to Grambling College freshmen who need remedial instruction in English.

(2) The described Laboratory Method (Method B) is apparently somewhat superior to the described Traditional Method (Method A) as a means of teaching spoken English skills to Grambling College freshmen who need remedial instruction in English.

(3) The two methods are equally effective in contributing to immediate subsequent improvement in written and spoken English skills of Grambling College freshmen who need remedial instruction in English.

(4) Under conditions described in this investigation, no demonstrated difference is to be expected in the two methods of teaching remedial English to Grambling College freshmen irrespective of their intelligence.

Some discussion will serve to show the full significance of the conclusions mentioned. Conclusions (1), (2) and (3) support a claim of superiority of the Laboratory Method (Method B) inasmuch as the experimental design employed significantly more students in

the Laboratory Method (Method B) than did the Traditional Method (Method A). That is, these data support the null hypothesis despite the fact that, for example, N was 53 and 69 respectively for Method A and B for data used in computing differences in improvement in written English. Even greater differences in N were used in computing differences in spoken English skills.

Two specific implications are derived from Conclusions (1), (2) and (3). The first is that Grambling College might more profitably utilize the Laboratory Method (Method B), and increase significantly the size of remedial English classes, than continue to use the Traditional Method (Method A). A second implication reflects the results of studying the performance of one control group (Method A) which employed some amount of electronic equipment. The implication is that future research might well reveal the existence of a proportion of the two methods in combination that would afford results superior to either method alone.

A rather obvious query at this point is what of the productivity of the Laboratory Method in regular English classes. Considering the extent to which regular English classes employ the traditional teaching approach as described herein, there seems to be good evidence to support the assumption that courses in Fundamental Composition and/or Basic College English might more economically, and with equal learning outcomes, be taught via the Laboratory Method.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bond, Gilbert L., "A Postwar Program for the Remedial-English Student," College English, VII: 466-70; May 1946.

2. Butterfield, Claire J., "The Effect of Knowledge of Certain Grammatical Elements on the Acquisition and Retention of Punctuation Skills." Doctor's Thesis. University of Iowa, 1945.

3. Carroll, John B., The Study of Language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955, p. 152.

4. Chamberlain, Essie, "The Laboratory Versus the Recitation Method of Teaching English Composition to Groups of Low Ability." Master's Thesis. University of Chicago, 1924.

5. College Composition and Communication, (A Symposium Report) "Has English Zero Seen Its Day?" College Composition and Communication VII: 73-95; May, 1957.

6. Fellow, J. E., "The Influence of Theme-Reading and Theme-Correction on Eliminating Technical Errors in Written Composition," University of Iowa Studies in Education. Vol. 7, No. 1, University of Iowa: Iowa City, March, 1932.

7. Garrett, H. E., Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longman's, Green and Company, 1958, p. 350.

8. Greene, H. A., "Direct Versus Formal Methods in Elementary English," Elementary English Review XIV: 273-85; 1947.

9. Greene, H. A., "English-Language, Grammar, and Communication," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1950, p. 389.

10. Eckert, Ruth E., "Colleges and Universities -- Programs," Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1960, p. 280.

11. Ivee, Sumner, "Linguistics in the Classroom," College English XXVII: 170-75; December, 1955.

12. Jaynes, Bryson L., "Remedial English and College Graduation," College Composition and Communication XIX: 23-25; February, 1950.

13. Linquist, E. F., "The Laboratory Method in Freshman English," Doctor's Thesis. University of Iowa, 1927.

14. Loy, William D., "The New Approach," College English IX: 206-212; January, 1948.

15. McGann, Mary, "Diagnostic Testing and Remedial Teaching of Common Errors in Mechanics of English Made by College Freshmen," Journal of Educational Psychology XXXVIII: 499-503; December, 1947.

16. National Council of Teachers of English, The English Language Arts. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1952, p. 284.

17. Pooley, Robert C., "Contributions of Research to the Teaching of English," English Journal XXVII: 170-175; April, 1948.

18. School and Society. "Nationwide Survey and Remedial Program in English Usage," School and Society LXVI: 311, October 25, 1947.

19. Seegers, J. C., "Improvement in Language Work," Elementary School Journal XXIV: 191-96; 1923.

20. Shepherd, Edith E., "A Preliminary Experiment in Teaching English Usage," Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 26, University of Chicago, 1925, p. 91-108.

21. Sherwood, John C., "The Oregon Experiment: A final report," College Composition and Communication XIX: 5-9, February, 1950.

22. Stewart, J. R., "The Effect of Diagramming on Certain Skills in English Composition." Doctor's Thesis. University of Iowa, 1941.

23. Thomas, J. E., "The Elimination of Technical Errors in Written Composition Through Formal Drill," (Studies in Education,) Vol. 8, No. 2. University of Iowa: Iowa City, 1932).

APPENDICE A

Raw Scores made on the English Expression Phase of the Cooperative English Test, Form 1A.

STUDENT NUMBER	Pretest Score	Re-test Score	Persistency Test Score
1	14	44	35
2	19	46	31
3	14	26	27
4	18	24	43
5	24	24	39
6	10	34	27
7	18	19	37
8	35	15	50
9	11	36	38
10	20	35	33
11	17	31	40
12	11	28	35
13	19	9	26
14	15	24	20
15	23	29	29
16	16	38	39
17	17	29	32
18	17	29	34
19	10	12	20
20	16	37	30
21	18	41	40
22	11	11	42
23	4	16	18
24	7	24	29
25	17	31	38
26	18	31	33
27	9	34	44
28	16	47	40
29	22	42	43
30	17	18	38
31	19	34	31
32	12	14	20
33	19	20	11
34	25	20	24
35	10	12	26
36	17	24	24
37	21	40	45
38	13	36	33
39	15	23	27
40	11	35	26

STUDENT NUMBER	Pretest Score	Re-test Score	Persistency Test Score
41	10	27	33
42	16	34	32
43	17	20	42
44	18	19	20
45	20	39	47
46	35	20	18
47	15	14	40
48	20	35	34
49	24	40	46
50	29	43	39
51	18	20	30
52	6	26	27
53	22	16	44
54	16	22	38
55	16	14	26
56	14	33	36
57	18	38	42
58	41	15	37
59	16	31	38
60	14	29	40
61	22	31	45
62	18	24	30
63	12	26	23
64	39	33	38
65	13	33	46
66	21	35	26
67	21	14	30
68	20	29	27
69	22	40	42
70	30	30	30
71	17	28	33
72	14	22	16
73	44	67	67
74	32	42	46
75	16	19	17
76	23	24	20
77	17	20	22
78	12	14	12
79	14	21	21
80	26	10	24

STUDENT NUMBER	Pretest Score	Re-test Score	Persistency Test Score
81	17	20	33
82	14	14	15
83	13	29	30
84	16	32	21
85	15	25	26
86	14	15	15
87	18	31	42
88	12	13	25
89	16	24	29
90	13	27	17
91	20	26	28
92	18	40	43
93	15	7	17
94	18	20	35
95	12	18	46
96	23	16	18
97	19	44	44
98	13	33	30
99	12	30	33
100	14	26	26
101	12	37	27
102	14	21	29
103	18	22	20
104	21	35	38
105	15	19	30
106	11	35	28
107	20	13	23
108	18	22	24
109	9	8	34
110	23	40	44
111	14	30	38
112	20	17	34
113	16	22	21
114	19	17	40
115	14	23	31
116	16	29	32
117	16	27	27
118	20	32	38
119	17	15	15
120	19	26	28

STUDENT NUMBER	Pretest Score	Re-test Score	Persistency Test Score
121	27	33	30
122	17	28	31
123	15	31	36
124	14	34	31
125	17	22	19
126	14	25	30
127	2	21	16
128	16	24	29
129	19	40	43
130	21	26	51
131	21	32	26
132	16	15	31
133	23	42	43
134	14	26	35
135	17	31	38
136	11	33	35
137	17	10	40
138	22	12	44
139	12	36	29
140	14	32	38
141	15	41	40
142	10	32	29
143	15	37	40
144	42	52	51

APPENDIX B

PRETEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Illiterate or colloquial expressions	24
	2. Wrong word	23
	3. Mispronunciation	16
	4. Weak example or faulty	9
	5. Redundancy	14
	6. Ah-ah	10
	7. "Why is because"	3
	8. Poor breath control	2
	9. Crutch (for instance)	2
	10. "S" on nouns	6
	11. Repetitions	4
	12. Idiom	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of "makes" with practice	39
	2. Agreement	45
	3. Confusion of adjective-adverb	12
	4. Verb form	12
	5. Choice of pronoun	3
	6. Possessive	1
	7. Number	1
Sentence Structure	1. Reversal of thought	27
	2. Antecedent	21
	3. Rambling construction	15
	4. Double negative	2
	5. Misplaced modifier	2
	6. Shift of person	2
	7. Omission	3
	8. Contradiction	1
	9. Double subject	2

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	206
Grammar	197
Sentence Structure	75

Total number of students in the group--42.

NOTE:

1. Mispronunciation of "perfect" was common.
2. Two students had resonant voices.
3. Two students used some well-chosen words.
4. One student was free of serious errors.

RE-TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	28
	2. Pronunciation	37
	3. Form of words (e.g. peoples)	9
	4. Weak example	8
	5. Needless insertion	6
	6. Misinterpretation of contradiction	6
	7. Illiterate word (s)	6
	8. Reason why is because	5
	9. Ambiguous statement	3
	10. Redundancy	3
	11. Grasping or choppy manner	3
	12. Idiom (prepositions)	2
Grammar	1. Practice make	84
	2. Agreement of verb	51
	3. Verb form	17
	4. Confusion of adjective-adverb	11
Sentence Structure	1. Sentence structure	14
	2. Reversal of sentence structure	9
	3. Shift	5
	4. Antecedent difficulty	4
	5. Groping manner	4
	6. Double negative	6
	7. Illogical statement	3
	8. Double subject	3
	9. Awkward statement	3
	10. Double comparison	3
	11. Omission of word	1
	12. Misplace of modifier	1

Summary of types of errors, number students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	116
Grammar	163
Sentence Structure	56

Total number of students in the group--53

PERSISTENCY TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	15
	2. Reason is because	19
	3. Redundancy	9
	4. Form of word (not verbs)	8
	5. Mispronunciation	7
	6. Wrong preposition (idiom)	4
	7. Insertion of unnecessary word (s)	4
	8. Weak example	3
	9. Misinterpretation	1
	10. Straying from subject	1
	11. Breath control	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of "practice" and "makes"	42
	2. Agreement of subject-verb	38
	3. Confusion of adjective-adverb	15
	4. Form of verb	8
	5. Degree of adjective	3
	6. Conjunctive mood	1
Sentence Structure	1. Construction of sentence	11
	2. Omission of word (s)	9
	3. Fumbling	6
	4. Reversal of construction	6
	5. Antecedent	4
	6. Shift	4
	7. Misplaced modifier	2
	8. Fused sentence	1
	9. Incomplete phrase	1
	10. Double negative	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	72
Grammar	107
Sentence Structure	45

Total number of students in group--41

NOTE:

1. Two students did not make any noticeable errors in discussing either of the proverbs.
2. Five students made errors with one of their proverbs.
3. Many students spoke so cautiously that it was obvious they were trying to avoid making mistakes.

PRETEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	25
	2. Pronunciation	13
	3. Misinterpretation	15
	4. Redundancy	5
	5. Illiterate or colloquial expression	7
	6. Requiring prompting	2
	7. Crutch ("I mean")	3
	8. Ambiguity	1
	9. Illiterate or colloquial expression	3
	10. Rambling	2
	11. Poor delivery	2
	12. Mispronunciation	3
	13. Poor example	2
	14. Repetition	2
	15. Wrong word	1
	16. Redundancy	2
	17. "Reason . . . because"	1
	18. Staccoto delivery	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of subject-verb	138
	2. Confusion of adjective-adverb	17
	3. Agreement of "makes" with "practice"	27
	4. Verb form	14
	5. Confusion of adjective-adverb	10
	6. Degree of adjective-adverb	14
	7. Choice of pronoun	4
	8. Agreement of "makes" with "practice"	2
	9. Agreement	3
Sentence Structure	1. Antecedent	14
	2. Omission	10
	3. Double subject	9
	4. Shift	6
	5. Reversal of thought	6
	6. Fused sentence and run-on sentences	4
	7. Jumbled construction	4
	8. Double negative	1
	9. Misplaced modifiers	4
	10. Parallelism	1
	11. Wish example	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	90
Grammar	218
Sentence structure	59

Total number of students--64

RE-TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Pronunciation	23
	2. Wrong word	15
	3. Incorrect form of word (not verb)	14
	4. Groping	11
	5. Redundancy	10
	6. Needless insertion	7
	7. Contradiction or misinterpretation	5
	8. Illiterate word (s)	7
	9. Grasping	4
	10. "Reason why is because"	2
	11. Ambiguous	2
	12. Idiom (preposition)	1
	13. Repetitious	1
	14. Wordy	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of verb with subject	36
	2. Verb form	18
	3. Practice make perfect	21
	4. Confusion of adjective-adverb	5
Sentence Structure	1. Reversal	6
	2. Antecedent	5
	3. Sentence structure	2
	4. Double negative	1
	5. Double comparison	1
	6. Awkward statement	1
	7. Omission	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	103
Grammar	70
Sentence Structure	17

Total number of students--27

PERSISTENCY TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Experimental Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Type of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	4
	2. Mispronunciation	4
	3. Reason why is because	4
	4. Wrong preposition (idiom)	2
	5. Weak example	2
	6. Clipped speech pattern	1
	7. Insertion of unnecessary word	1
	8. Misinterpretation	1
	9. Redundancy	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of "practice" with "makes"	10
	2. Confusion of adjective-adverb	7
	3. Form of verb	6
	4. Agreement of subject-verb	6
	5. Subjunctive mood	1
Sentence Structure	1. Reversal of construction	3
	2. Double negative	4
	3. Construction of sentence	2
	4. Shift	2
	5. Contradiction	1
	6. Double subject	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	20
Grammar	30
Sentence Structure	13

Total number of students--20

PRETEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	19
	2. Mispronunciation	12
	3. Reason why . . . because	8
	4. Rambling	7
	5. Redundancy	4
	6. Illiterate expression	3
	7. Poor tone and breath quality	2
	8. Weak example	2
Grammar	1. Agreement of "makes" with "practice"	19
	2. Agreement	19
	3. Verb form	9
	4. Confusion of adjective-adverb	5
	5. Degree of adjective	1
Sentence Structure	1. Reversal	9
	2. Antecedent	3
	3. Misplaced word	2
	4. Shift	2
	5. Double subject	1
	6. Double negative	1
	7. Parallelism	1
	8. Omission	1

Summary of types of errors, number students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	57
Grammar	53
Sentence structure	20

Total number of students in the group--22

RE-TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
	1. Use of "you" for indefinite "one"	40 repeatedly by all
	2. Pronunciation	8
Diction	3. Misinterpretation	4
	4. Misinterpretation	2
	5. Illiterate colloquial expression	1
	1. Agreement of verb with subject	22
	2. Verb form	11
Grammar	3. Agreement of "makes" with "perfect"	6
	4. Confusing adjective with noun	1
	5. Confusing adjective with adverb	1
Sentence	1. Shift in tense	6
Structure	2. Antecedent	6

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	55
Grammar	41
Sentence Structure	12

Total number of students--23

PERSISTENCY TEST DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class I (Miller)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Reason why is because	6
	2. Wrong word	6
	3. Redundancy	5
	4. Confusion of adjective-adverb	3
	5. Misinterpretation	3
	6. Form of word (not verbs)	3
	7. Wordiness	1
	8. Fumbling	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of subject-verb	26
	2. Agreement of "practice" with "makes"	10
	3. Form of verb	1
Sentence Structure	1. Construction of sentence	4
	2. Double subject	2
	3. Antecedent	2
	4. Reversal of comtruction	1
	5. Omission of necessary word	1
	6. Shift	1
	7. Insertion of unnecessary word	1
	8. Misplaced modifier	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	28
Grammar	37
Sentence Structure	13

Total number of students--19

NOTE:

Four students made errors with only <u>one</u> of their proverbs.

PRETEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Types of Errors	Frequency	
Diction	1. Use of "you" for indefinite "one"	56	Repeatedly by all
	2. Wrong word	14	
	3. Pronunciation	9	
	4. Misinterpretation	6	
	5. Definition by "is when" and "life if"	6	
	6. Illiterate or colloquial expression	3	
	7. Ambiguity	3	
	8. Adjective (intensive e.g. "ugly, ugly")	1	
	9. Crutch (well)	1	
Grammar	1. Agreement of subject-verb	52	
	2. Agreement of "makes" with "practice"	43	
	3. Verb form	10	
	4. Confusing adjective and noun	1	
Sentence Structure	1. Antecedent	10	
	2. Reversal of thought	4	
	3. Omission	4	
	4. Double subject	2	
	5. Fused sentences	2	
	6. Double negative	2	
	7. Requiring prompting	1	

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of errors	Frequency
Diction	99
Grammar	106
Sentence Structure	24

Total number of students--35

RE-TEST RAW DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	21
	2. Pronunciation	27
	3. Form of word (not verbs)	7
	4. Redundancy	7
	5. Illiterate word (s)	7
	6. Weak example	5
	7. Idiom (Prepositions)	5
	8. "Reason why is because"	5
	9. Misinterpretation or contradiction	2
	10. Groping	2
	11. Repetition	1
Grammar	1. Practice make perfect	49
	2. Agreement (subject-verb)	30
	3. Verb form	16
	4. Confusion of adjective-adverb	7
Sentence Structure	1. Reversal	13
	2. Needless insertion	8
	3. Sentence structure	11
	4. Antecedent	3
	5. Shift	3
	6. Double subject	2
	7. Double comparison	2
	8. Fragment	1
	9. Misplaced modifier	3
	10. Double negative	1
	11. Awkward	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	89
Grammar	102
Sentence structure	48

Total number of students--30

PERSISTENCY TEST DATA OF SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE
Control Group - Class II (Simmons)

	Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	1. Wrong word	6
	2. Wrong preposition (idiom)	3
	3. Redundancy	2
	4. Weak example	1
	5. Mispronunciation	1
Grammar	1. Agreement of "practice" with "make"	12
	2. Agreement of subject-verb	8
	3. Confusion of adjective-adverb	4
	4. Form of verb	1
Sentence Structure	1. Construction of sentence	4
	2. Contradiction	2
	3. Double subject	1
	4. Double negative	1
	5. Antecedent	1

Summary of types of errors, number of students making errors and frequency of errors.

Types of Errors	Frequency
Diction	13
Grammar	25
Sentence structure	9

Total number of students--16

NOTE:

1. Two students gave very intelligent and clear responses.
2. Six students made errors with only one proverb.

TABLE 19 -- RECORD OF ERRORS MADE (SCORES) ON THE "SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE"*

Key:

G - Errors in Grammar
D - Errors in Diction
S - Errors in Sentence Structure

Pre-T - Pretest
Re-T - First re-test
3-T - Second (persistency) re-test

	Type of Error	Frequency of Error		
		Pre-T	Re-T	3-T
Experimental		(N = 72)	(N = 53)	(N = 41)
Class I	G	197	163	107
(Miller)	D	206	116	72
	S	75	56	45
Experimental		(N = 64)	(N = 27)	(N = 20)
Class II	G	218	70	30
(Simmons)	D	90	103	20
	S	59	17	13
Control		(N = 22)	N = 23)	(N = 19)
Class I	G	53	41	37
(Miller)	D	57	55	28
	S	20	12	13
Control		(N = 35)	(N = 30)	(N = 16)
Class II	G	106	102	25
(Simmons)	D	99	89	13
	S	24	48	9

*Groups were uneven in size. In order to accommodate Chi-Square computation, the original pretest and first re-test scores shown here were altered so as to have the same relationship to the number of students taking these tests as the 3-test scores had to the number of students taking the second re-test.

APPENDIX C

SPOKEN ENGLISH SCALE

A. Direction for Administration

(Prompter says to student.)

Consider the attached list of twenty-five well-known proverbs and folk sayings below. You will be asked to make a 3-part response regarding two of them. Of the two passages, one will be selected for you and the other will be your choice. Here is what is asked of you about each passage:

(1) Say in your own words what the passage means.

(2) Illustrate its meaning by the use of an example involving yourself and others.

(3) Tell me of your belief in the truthfulness of the passage and why you do or do not believe it.

Before you begin, I wish reiterate that this exercise is actually a test of your verbal skills; not your understanding of the passage. Do your best to show your knowledge of correct spoken English.

Now you may begin. Please state your name, announce your choice of passage and speak loud enough so that what you say will be recorded on tape.

B. The Selection of Proverbs and Folk Sayings

The proverbs and folk sayings used as verbal stimulus elicitors to the Spoken English Scale were derived by pilot study involving sixteen freshmen students assigned to remedial English. The sixteen students were each shown a list of twenty-five passages and asked to select and

discuss any two. The two most frequently chosen proverbs and/or folk sayings were later used as constant response elicitors in the Spoken English Scale, each being matched with one proverb or folk saying chosen from the list by the student to be tested.

C. The List of Proverbs and Folk Sayings:

The following proverbs and folk sayings comprised the original list of passages basic to the "Spoken English Scale":

1. A stitch in time saves nine.
2. A bird in hand is worth two in the bush.
3. He can't see the forest for the trees.
4. A rolling stone gathers no moss.
5. Look before you leap.
6. Seeing is believing.
7. Practice makes perfect.
8. Don't count your chickens before they hatch.
9. Beauty is only skin deep.
10. He's proud as a peacock.
11. Don't cry over spilled milk.
12. Love thy neighbor as thyself.
13. Truth crushed to earth will rise again.
14. Might makes right.
15. A penny saved is a penny earned.
16. All that glitters is not gold.
17. You can't have your cake and eat it, too.
18. You can't burn the candle at both ends.
19. You can't teach an old dog new tricks.
20. An empty barrel makes the most noise.
21. People in glass houses shouldn't throw stones.
22. Cowards die many times before their death.
23. It is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all.
24. All's well that ends well.
25. Don't put all your eggs in one basket.

D. Results of Pilot Study.

The following represents the results of pilot recordings made in effort to perfect the Spoken English Scale and to select the best known folk sayings and proverbs.

TAPE ONE (MR. MILLER)

Student One

Love thy neighbor as thyself.
1. "Be in the same different way . . ."
2. "neighbor . . . them"
3. "if you be good"
4. frequent use of "ah. . . ah"
5. mispronunciation of "like"
6. shallow reasoning

All that glitters is not gold.
1. mispronunciation of "for it"
2. "something that make it shine"
3. "and this thing it wears off"
4. "my ring it's not gold"
5. poor example of sun is shining but is not gold

Student Two

Seeing is believing.
1. use of "ah-ah"
2. "that person . . . they"

Practice makes perfect.
1. "The only way he can get better is to practice so that it will be perfect."
2. ". . . because I have practiced it a many number of times"

Student Three

A bird in hand is better than two in the bush.
1. "what I mean by this I mean a bird that you're sure you . . ."
2. frequent hesitation and reversal of approach

Don't count your chickens before they hatch.
"I promised to pay something thinking I was only to get some money but I didn't receive the money by this I didn't receive the money."

Student Four

Practice makes perfect.
1. mispronunciation of "every"
2. practice make perfect

An empty barrel makes a lot of noise.
1. "barrel make most noise"
2. "a person . . . they"
3. "they person that always meddling"

Student Five

Practice makes perfect.
1. "I mean myself I play music."

Seeing is believing.
1. "a man comes up and tell me"
2. "why I think seeing is believing is because . . ."
3. "The only way I would believe it would be if I was to see it with my own two eyes."

Student Six

A stitch in time saves nine.
No noticeable errors.

An empty barrel makes the most noise.
Mispronunciation of "most" so that it sounds like "more" and "most"

Student Seven

Seeing is believing.
"I think that in my opinion"

You shouldn't count your chickens before they hatch.
"I couldn't be sure if I be living tomorrow"

TAPE TWO (MRS. SIMMONS AND MR. LEMELLE)

Student One

Beauty is only skin deep.
1. "a girl can be real pretty"
2. "look unbeautiful"
3. "a person that does not . . ."

Don't count your chickens before they hatch.
"if you was expecting some money . . ."

Seeing is believing.
1. mispronunciation of "for instance" as "for r enstance"
2. illogical illustration

Student Two

Seeing is believing.
1. "never take anything what a person says"
2. "because of fact that never believe what someone else says"

Don't count your chickens before they hatch.
"this actually mean . . ."

Student Three

Practice makes perfect.
1. "practice make . . ."
2. "I don't only practice . . ."

You can't have your cake and eat it, too.
1. "would be kinda selfish to want both"
2. poor illustration about typewriter and tape recorder

Student Four

Don't cry over spilled milk.
1. horrible example (Mary bumped into me and make me spill the milk)
2. No response to the third question about the truthfulness of the proverb

Don't burn the candle on both ends.
1. "it only has one end to be burned on"
2. disgusted tone throughout the recording
3. "it can only be burned on one end"

Student Five

Practice makes perfect.
1. "like for an example if you are playing basketball"
2. "the better you practice the better you know"

Love thy neighbor as thyself.
1. slightly bored tone
2. mispronunciation of "door"
3. "I believe the truth in the passage"

Student Six (Mr. LeMelle began here)

A stitch in time saves nine.
1. frequent use of "ah ah"
2. "if it come at the right time"
3. poor illustration about ID card and receipt at game

Love thy neighbor as thyself.
1. "like to live for the people around you to respect you"
2. "I hear it a lots in church"

Student Seven

A bird in hand is worth two in the bush.
1. "to think I be getting $2 from somebody who owe me $2"
2. "the picnic that I was supposed to go on the bus broke down"

You can't teach an old dog new tricks.
1. "all the while I been playing left hand"
2. mispronunciation of "hard"
3. "he say he never could play a bass drum"

Student Eight

Practice makes perfect
1. "become such accustomed to it"

Student Nine

Don't put all your eggs in one basket.
"I would say like if for example you were going to do . . ."

TALLY

Passages chosen are listed below. The first number is the number the proverb was associated with on the original list. The number in parentheses is the number of choices from this group of students.

7. Practice makes perfect. (6)

6. Seeing is believing. (5)

8. Don't count your chickens before they hatch. (4)

12. Love thy neighbor as thyself. (3)

20. An empty barrel makes the most noise. (3)

1. A stitch in time saves nine. (2)

2. A bird in hand is worth two in the bush. (2)

16. All that glitters is not gold. (1)

11. Don't cry over spilled milk. (1)

17. You can't have your cake and eat it, too. (1)

18. You can't burn the candle at both ends. (1)

19. You can't teach an old dog new tricks. (1)

9. Beauty is only skin deep. (1)

25. Don't put all your eggs in one basket. (1)

The kinds of errors made on these tapes are itemized below:

Nature of Error	Frequency of Error
Contradiction and/or faulty logic	7
Agreement of pronoun and antecedent	7
Form of verb	14
Mispronunciation	7
Annoying use of "ah"	3
Poor choice of words (diction)	7
Double subject	1
Groping leading to reversal of approach	1
Omission of word (s)	4
Redundancy	2
"why-because" error	2
Subjunctive mood	2
Coinage of unorthodox word	1
Incorrect choice of relative pronoun	2
Incorrect use of "only"	3
Incorrect use of "like"	2

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Yvonne P. McCree
/t/ Yvonne P. McCree

September 26, 1962

Based on result of the pilot study, Passage #6 and #7 of the original list were assigned to each student during the pretest and re-test, respectively. Passage #6 was used a third time during the second (persistency) re-test. In addition to the assigned passage, each student was asked to select one passage to discuss. This selected passage was used as a decoy designed to counter interpolated practice on Passages #6 or #7 prior to the first and second re-test.

APPENDIX D

COPY

English Department
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana

Mr. John A. Beasley
Testing Service
Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana

Dear Mr. Beasley:

Because you are always very prompt in dispatching test results, this note may not be necessary. In addition to needing a relative ranking list of test results of freshmen for grouping (humanities, reading, remedial English) I will be needing a relative ranking list in English (from the highest to the lowest) in order to make proper assignments to students who will be involved in an experiment for which Grambling has made commitments to the Federal Government. To avoid much confusion, we will need this information before the Orientation Committee makes the schedule for freshman.

Kindly give me twelve copies of this relative ranking in English as soon as possible. Please let me know if the list you send includes the names of freshmen who were tested during the latter part last summer session

For this rush job, we will be very appreciative.

Yours truly,

Bessie E. Dickerson

BED/mcd

cc: Dr. Lamore Carter
Dr. E. L. Cole
Mr. Leon Whittaker
Mr. Tilden LeMelle

COPY

To: Mr. Miller and Mrs. Simmons

Date: September 13, 1962

From: _____
Bessie E. Dickerson

In your experimental classes in Remedial English (two each) make sure that the enrollment is as follows:

Experimental Group Class -- 40 or more
Control Group Class -- no more than 25

Because of your experimentation, your enrollments, of necessity, will be different from other teachers of remedial English.

cc: Dr. L. Carter
Mr. T. J. LeMelle

COPY

To: Dr. Carter
Mr. LeMelle
Mrs. Simmons
Mrs. McCree

From: Bessie E. Dickerson, Head, English Department

Date: September 18, 1962

There will be a meeting of the teachers of Experimental Method in Remedial English Thursday, September 20, 1962, at 2:00 p.m. in Room A-24.

Agenda:

1. Checking rolls according to test results
2. Clarification of responsibilities
3. Review of the experiment
   Mrs. McCree and Dr. Carter
4. Report of assignments made in the last meeting
5. "What Has Been Done In the Classes"
   Mrs. Simmons and Mr. Miller
6. Next steps

NOTICE: Please bring program to meeting

COPY

MEMO

TO: Teachers of Comparative Study Date: September 21, 1962

From: Bessie E. Dickerson

1. Experimental Group

A. Mrs. Simmons	11	TThS	A-6	Enrollment-32
B. Mr. Miller	10	MWF	I-5	Enrollment-32

2. Controlled Group

A. Mrs. Simmons	9	MWF	A-25	Enrollment-30
B. Mr. Miller	12	MWF	I-5	Enrollment-29

3. The enrollment needs to be increased in both experimental groups.
4. Accompany students in A-14 (Mrs. Garner's class) to language laboratory - Mrs. Simmons.
5. Pre-test of proverbs of remedial students from Mrs. Garner's class Saturday, Sept. 22 in the language laboratory:
   A. Recorder - Mr. LeMelle
   B. Prompters - Mr. Miller and Mrs. Simmons
   C. Consultant - Mrs. McCree
   D. Observer - Dr. Carter
6. After pilot-study, list the quotations which will be used in the experiment beginning Monday, Sept. 24 - Mrs. McCree
7. Mr. Miller and Mrs. Simmons, if needed, get training for using the recorders from Mr. Roy Moss. It is advised that the teachers train two students, from each of their classes, to use the tape recorder.
8. Pre-test all students in all four groups beginning Monday, Sept. 24 through Saturday, Sept. 29 - Mr. Miller and Mrs. Simmons.
9. Give schedule of hours and days which are not in use in the language laboratory - Mr. LeMelle

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Sat.
8						
9						
10						
11						
12						
1						
2						
3						
4						

10. At the end of the hour of the pilot-study in the language laboratory Saturday, Sept. 23, all will give reactions.
11. There will be a meeting of all in the Comparative Study on Thursday, September 27, at 2:00 p.m. in A-25.

M E M O

Date February 26, 1963

TO: President R. W. E. Jones
Dean E. L. Cole

FROM: Lamore J. Carter
Director - Research Project 1704

The 160 students involved in our Research Project 1704 (joint contract between Grambling College and United States Office of Education) have been commendably cooperative as they submitted to a full semester of experimentation. Now that the experimentation is over and these students are scattered in the various classes, we are obliged to locate them, give them another orientation session and additional testing. As this will be a voluntary activity f these students, we feel we have an urgent need of the following items at the expense of the college:

14 Dozen Cookies
10 Gallons of Punch

Without these items for use at our orientation session early next week, we feel sure that the validity of our final testing will be offset by increasing deterioration of student mood for learning as structured by the Research Project.

cc: Miss Bessie Dickerson

APPROVED

Feb 28 1962

/s/ R. W. E. Jones
President

COPY

COPY

Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana
February 27, 1963

Dear _____,

You are taking part in an important experiment dealing with the teaching of English. No doubt your English teacher mentioned this fact to you during the first semester of this session. This experiment will mean much to you, to the English teachers, to Grambling College, to the Office of Education of the United States and to English teachers everywhere.

I wish to thank you for the important part that you are playing.

I am not sure that I know you as well as I should. For this reason I am asking you and the other freshmen, who are participating in this experiment, to meet with me, Mr. Miller, Mrs. Simmons, Dr. Carter, Miss Dickerson, Mrs. McCree and Mc. LeMelle in the Testing Center (the old dining hall) on Wednesday, March 6 at 6:30 p.m. to get acquainted and to discuss some important matters about your future. Do not forget; check your calendar. Be prepared to tell me what you are doing in your English class during this semester.

Very sincerely yours,

/s/ E. L. Cole
/t/ E. L. Cole, Dean
Grambling College

ELC/mmh

COPY

Grambling College
Grambling, Louisiana
March 13, 1963

Dear _____.

This is the second letter that I have written you. The first one was for the purpose of seeing you and becoming acquainted with you, but this one is for a different reason.

As you have been informed, you and Grambling College have a contract with the United States Office of Education. Our obligations must be fulfilled. I have been informed that, as yet, you have not gone to the language laboratory to make the last of your recordings. You are being asked to go to the language laboratory between classes on Saturday, March 16th to complete your work. Mr. Miller, Mr. Le Melle, and Mrs. Simmons will be there from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon Saturday, March 16th to work with you. This will, most likely, be your last chance to make the recording. If you fail to do so Saturday, you will be called in for questioning which may, of necessity, cause you to miss some of your classes. Missing classes is a dangerous practice. Many undesirable situations can result from this practice.

I am sorry that I was unable to be with you in your first meeting. Dr. McIntoch consented to serve in my place.

During your first year at Grambling, I am wishing for you much success.

Very sincerely,

/s/ E. L. Cole
/t/ E. L. Cole
Dean of the College